

Remarks/Arguments

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, and 6-10, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oya (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,098 B1), in view of Perlman et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2007/0147406 A1), hereinafter “Perlman”.

It is respectfully asserted that neither Oya nor Perlman, alone or in combination, discloses a video apparatus:

“wherein the processing means for receiving the analog video signal and outputting a compression encoded stream based on the video signal includes an adjustable filter and wherein the control means includes means for adjusting the adjustable filter based on the indicator,”

as described in currently amended claim 1.

Among the problems addressed by the present invention is the noise in received analog RF video signals and the negative impact that noise creates, for instance, macro-blocked defects, in the output of an encoding process, such as MPEG encoding. To address this problem, the present application discloses a system where filtering of the signal to be encoded is adjusted based upon an indicator of a characteristic of the received analog RF signal.

In contrast, Oya teaches a system where “optimal RF AGC points are individually set for a terrestrial digital television signal and a CATV digital signal. A switch is changed according to whether an input signal is a terrestrial digital television signal or a CATV digital signal. If the terrestrial digital television signal is input, the voltage for setting the RF AGC point is set to a reference voltage V1 output from a first reference power supply source. If the CATV digital signal is input, the voltage for setting the RF AGC point is set to a reference voltage V2 output from a second reference power supply source. A comparator then outputs an RF AGC signal according to a difference between an IF AGC signal and the reference voltage.” (Oya Abstract)

Oya receives a digital television signal (either terrestrial digital television or CATV digital), not an analog signal. Therefore, Oya fails to disclose a video apparatus “wherein the processing means for receiving the analog video signal and outputting a compression encoded stream based on the video signal includes an adjustable filter and wherein the control means includes means for adjusting the adjustable filter based on the indicator,” as described in claim 1.

Perlman teaches “a computer-implemented method is disclosed including: receiving a broadcast signal containing a set of multiplexed multimedia channels; storing said multiplexed multimedia channels in a temporary storage buffer on a mass storage device; determining a point in said temporary storage buffer to begin demultiplexing and decoding a first channel responsive to a user request to view a particular program on said first channel in its entirety, said point indicating the start of said program on said first channel; and demultiplexing and decoding said first channel of said set of multiplexed multimedia channels from said point within said temporary storage buffer.” (Perlman Abstract)

Perlman does not disclose the use of an adjustable filter in the encoding and compression of an analog signal, or more specifically, the adjustment of such a filter based upon an indicator of a characteristic of the analog signal. Therefore, Perlman, like Oya, fails to disclose a video apparatus “wherein the processing means for receiving the analog video signal and outputting a compression encoded stream based on the video signal includes an adjustable filter and wherein the control means includes means for adjusting the adjustable filter based on the indicator,” as described in claim 1.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims, it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure provided by Oya or Perlman, alone or in combination, that makes the present invention as claimed in currently amended claim 1 unpatentable. It is further submitted that newly added independent claim 16 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Since dependent claims 3-4 and 6-10 are dependent from allowable independent claim 1, it is submitted that they too are allowable

for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 11-15, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oya (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,098 B1), in view of Perlman et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2007/0147406 A1), as applied to claims 1-4 and 6-10 above, and further in view of Krishnamurthy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,508,748).

Since dependent claims 5 and 11-15 are dependent from independent claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons described above, it is submitted that they too are allowable for at least the same reasons that currently amended claim 1 is allowable. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's representative at (609) 734-6804, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian J. Cromarty/

By: Brian J Cromarty
Reg. No. 64018
Phone (609) 734-6804

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
March 23, 2009